

**INTERNATIONAL SECURITY / MIDDLE EAST UPDATE**  
**June 17 - 24, 2010**

1. [President Obama on General McChrystal's Resignation](#) (06-23-2010)
  2. [General Petraeus Picked to Head Military Efforts in Afghanistan](#) (06-23-2010)
  3. [A Nuclear Armed Iran Poses an Intolerable Threat, Senator Says](#) (06-22-2010)
  4. [Statement on Gaza by the Middle East Quartet](#) (06-21-2010)
  5. [Ambassador Holbrooke at U.S.-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue Meeting](#) (06-19-2010)
  6. [State's Gordon on U.S. New Approach to Russia](#) (06-18-2010)
  7. [New START Enhances U.S.-Russian Relations](#) (06-17-2010)
- 

**1. [President Obama on General McChrystal's Resignation](#) (06-23-2010)****Obama nominates General Petraeus to take command in Afghanistan**

The White House, Office of the Press Secretary

Statement by the President

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon. Today I accepted General Stanley McChrystal's resignation as commander of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. I did so with considerable regret, but also with certainty that it is the right thing for our mission in Afghanistan, for our military, and for our country.

I'm also pleased to nominate General David Petraeus to take command in Afghanistan, which will allow us to maintain the momentum and leadership that we need to succeed.

I don't make this decision based on any difference in policy with General McChrystal, as we are in full agreement about our strategy. Nor do I make this decision out of any sense of personal insult. Stan McChrystal has always shown great courtesy and carried out my orders faithfully. I've got great admiration for him and for his long record of service in uniform.

Over the last nine years, with America fighting wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, he has earned a reputation as one of our nation's finest soldiers. That reputation is founded upon his extraordinary

dedication, his deep intelligence, and his love of country. I relied on his service, particularly in helping to design and lead our new strategy in Afghanistan. So all Americans should be grateful for General McChrystal's remarkable career in uniform.

But war is bigger than any one man or woman, whether a private, a general, or a president. And as difficult as it is to lose General McChrystal, I believe that it is the right decision for our national security.

The conduct represented in the recently published article does not meet the standard that should be set by a commanding general. It undermines the civilian control of the military that is at the core of our democratic system. And it erodes the trust that's necessary for our team to work together to achieve our objectives in Afghanistan.

My multiple responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief led me to this decision. First, I have a responsibility to the extraordinary men and women who are fighting this war, and to the democratic institutions that I've been elected to lead. I've got no greater honor than serving as Commander-in-Chief of our men and women in uniform, and it is my duty to ensure that no diversion complicates the vital mission that they are carrying out.

That includes adherence to a strict code of conduct. The strength and greatness of our military is rooted in the fact that this code applies equally to newly enlisted privates and to the general officer who commands them. That allows us to come together as one. That is part of the reason why America has the finest fighting force in the history of the world.

It is also true that our democracy depends upon institutions that are stronger than individuals. That includes strict adherence to the military chain of command, and respect for civilian control over that chain of command. And that's why, as Commander-in-Chief, I believe this decision is necessary to hold ourselves accountable to standards that are at the core of our democracy.

Second, I have a responsibility to do what is -- whatever is necessary to succeed in Afghanistan, and in our broader effort to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al Qaeda. I believe that this mission demands unity of effort across our alliance and across my national security team. And I don't think that we can sustain that unity of effort and achieve our objectives in Afghanistan without making this change. That, too, has guided my decision.

I've just told my national security team that now is the time for all of us to come together. Doing so is not an option, but an obligation. I welcome debate among my team, but I won't tolerate division. All of us have personal interests; all of us have opinions. Our politics often fuels conflict, but we have to renew our sense of common purpose and meet our responsibilities to one another, and to our troops who are in harm's way, and to our country.

We need to remember what this is all about. Our nation is at war. We face a very tough fight in Afghanistan. But Americans don't flinch in the face of difficult truths or difficult tasks. We persist and we persevere. We will not tolerate a safe haven for terrorists who want to destroy Afghan security from within, and launch attacks against innocent men, women, and children in our country and around the world.

So make no mistake: We have a clear goal. We are going to break the Taliban's momentum. We are going to build Afghan capacity. We are going to relentlessly apply pressure on al Qaeda and its leadership, strengthening the ability of both Afghanistan and Pakistan to do the same.

That's the strategy that we agreed to last fall; that is the policy that we are carrying out, in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

In that effort, we are honored to be joined by allies and partners who have stood by us and paid the ultimate price through the loss of their young people at war. They are with us because the interests and values that we share, and because this mission is fundamental to the ability of free people to live in peace and security in the 21st century.

General Petraeus and I were able to spend some time this morning discussing the way forward. I'm extraordinarily grateful that he has agreed to serve in this new capacity. It should be clear to everybody, he does so at great personal sacrifice to himself and to his family. And he is setting an extraordinary example of service and patriotism by assuming this difficult post.

Let me say to the American people, this is a change in personnel but it is not a change in policy. General Petraeus fully participated in our review last fall, and he both supported and helped design the strategy that we have in place. In his current post at Central Command, he has worked closely with our forces in Afghanistan. He has worked closely with Congress. He has worked closely with the Afghan and Pakistan governments and with all our partners in the region. He has my full confidence, and I am urging the Senate to confirm him for this new assignment as swiftly as possible.

Let me conclude by saying that it was a difficult decision to come to the conclusion that I've made today. Indeed, it saddens me to lose the service of a soldier who I've come to respect and admire. But the reasons that led me to this decision are the same principles that have supported the strength of our military and our nation since the founding.

So, once again, I thank General McChrystal for his enormous contributions to the security of this nation and to the success of our mission in Afghanistan. I look forward to working with General Petraeus and my entire national security team to succeed in our mission. And I reaffirm that America stands as one in our support for the men and women who defend it.

Thank you very much.

---

## **2. General Petraeus Picked to Head Military Efforts in Afghanistan (06-23-2010)**

By Stephen Kaufman  
Staff Writer

Washington — President Obama has named General David Petraeus, the head of the U.S. Central Command, to replace General Stanley McChrystal as commander of U.S. and NATO coalition forces in Afghanistan, following Obama's acceptance of McChrystal's resignation.

"War is bigger than any one man or woman, whether a private, a general or a president. And as difficult as it is to lose General McChrystal, I believe that it is the right decision for our national security," Obama told reporters June 23 at the White House.

Petraeus, whose current command oversees the operations in both Afghanistan and Iraq, was a full participant in the Obama administration's 2009 strategy review for Afghanistan, and supported and helped to design the current strategy of building up the capacity of Afghan governance and security while breaking the momentum of the Taliban, the president said.

"This is a change in personnel but it is not a change in policy," Obama said. Petraeus "has worked closely with the Afghan and Pakistan governments and with all our partners in the region," and he "has my full confidence," the president said.

As America's top commander in Iraq, Petraeus oversaw the successful "surge" that dramatically reduced violence in that country, setting the stage for political reform and continued progress on reconstruction and economic development. He has led U.S. operations in Afghanistan and Iraq since October 2008, at the Central Command.

McChrystal offered to resign his command after Rolling Stone magazine published statements made by him and his staff that were critical of senior Obama administration officials; Obama said such conduct "does not meet the standard that should be set by a commanding general." Defense Secretary Robert Gates said June 22 that McChrystal had "made a significant mistake and exercised poor judgment in this case."

Obama said the U.S. military and its role in government are dependent on a strict code of conduct and respect for civilian control of the military, and that McChrystal's remarks undermined that balance and eroded the trust the president needs among his civilian and military advisers to achieve U.S. objectives in Afghanistan.

"Our democracy depends upon institutions that are stronger than individuals. That includes strict adherence to the military chain of command, and respect for civilian control over that chain of command. And that's why, as commander in chief, I believe this decision is necessary to hold ourselves accountable to standards that are at the core of our democracy," Obama said.

In a June 23 statement, McChrystal expressed strong support for President Obama's strategy in Afghanistan, as well as a deep commitment to coalition partners and the Afghan people. "It was out of respect for this commitment — and a desire to see the mission succeed — that I tendered my resignation," he said.

The president said his decision to accept McChrystal's resignation was not made because of policy or personal differences and he paid tribute to the general's long military service and his "extraordinary dedication, his deep intelligence and his love of country."

"It saddens me to lose the service of a soldier who I've come to respect and admire," Obama said. "But the reasons that led me to this decision are the same principles that have supported the strength of our military and our nation since the founding."

Obama urged the U.S. Senate to confirm Petraeus "as swiftly as possible" and said the United States will "persist and ... persevere" in Afghanistan.

"We will not tolerate a safe haven for terrorists who want to destroy Afghan security from within and launch attacks against innocent men, women and children in our country and around the world," he said.

"We have a clear goal," Obama said. "We are going to break the Taliban's momentum. We are going to build Afghan capacity. We are going to relentlessly apply pressure on al-Qaida and its leadership, strengthening the ability of both Afghanistan and Pakistan to do the same."

---

### **3. A Nuclear Armed Iran Poses an Intolerable Threat, Senator Says (06-22-2010)**

By Merle David Kellerhals Jr.  
Staff Writer

Washington — A nuclear armed Iran would “pose an intolerable threat” to the Middle East and undermine global efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry says.

That is why the U.N. Security Council found it necessary June 9 to level its [fourth round of sanctions](#) against Iran’s nuclear program, and why the United States [further expanded U.S. sanctions](#) on many of Iran’s groups and individuals on June 16, Kerry said during a hearing June 22 on the sanctions. The European Union and Australia announced efforts June 17 to further strengthen measures against Iran in the wake of the Security Council decision.

“These steps to increase pressure are necessary not because we want to target Iran, but because Iran itself has decided to continue to defy the international community, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the U.N. Security Council,” Kerry said.

Estimates indicate that Iran has approximately 2,400 kilograms of reactor-grade, low-enriched uranium in stocks at its Natanz enrichment facility, which is enough material for two nuclear weapons. And estimates are that Iran has begun producing small quantities of uranium to a concentration of about 20 percent, crossing a nuclear threshold that experts believe could lead to nuclear weapons production, Kerry said.

The primary purpose of the latest Security Council sanctions is to target Iranian military purchases and trade and financial transactions carried out by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, as well as banks and maritime companies.

Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana, the senior Republican on the committee, said that while it is difficult to know exactly where Iran’s nuclear development program stands, it is clear that the regime in Tehran is not complying with international nonproliferation agreements and has stymied efforts to work with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its inspectors.

William Burns, the State Department’s under secretary for political affairs, told senators that the June 9 Security Council decision imposes the most comprehensive international sanctions that the Tehran regime has faced to date, and aims to hold Iran accountable for its obligations.

The essential reason for so much international concern about Tehran’s decision to pursue a nuclear weapons development program is the instability it creates in the Middle East and the threat it poses to the global economy and security, Burns testified.

“These risks are only reinforced by the wider actions of the Iranian leadership, particularly its long-standing support for terrorist groups, its opposition to Middle East peace, its repugnant rhetoric about Israel, the Holocaust and so much else, and its brutal repression of its own citizens,” Burns said. “In the face of those challenges, American policy is straightforward.”

Burns warned the senators that Iran’s destabilizing actions in the region and beyond must be countered while efforts are made to advance broader interests in democracy, human rights and development across the Middle East. Over the past 18 months, the Obama administration has

pursued a combination of “tough-minded diplomacy” that included engagement and pressure, and active security cooperation with partners in the Gulf and beyond, he added.

“We’ve sought to sharpen the choices before the Iranian leadership. We’ve sought to demonstrate what’s possible if Iran meets its international obligations and adheres to the same responsibilities that apply to other nations,” Burns said. “And we’ve sought to intensify the costs of continued defiance and to show Iran that pursuit of a nuclear weapons program will make it less secure, not more secure.”

However, Burns said it was the Tehran regime’s “intransigence” that left no other choice but to use restrictive economic and political pressure.

Congress is considering legislation that would impose even greater pressures on Iran and those who trade with it. White House press secretary Robert Gibbs said [in a June 21 statement](#) that President Obama will continue to work with Congress as it completes work on the bill.

Treasury Under Secretary Stuart Levey told senators that the efforts by the Obama administration on Iran work along two fronts. The first is governmental action that includes the United Nations and other governments and efforts to build on four Security Council resolutions to impose sanctions. Talks are already under way with other governments on robust actions to implement the latest Security Council sanctions, he added.

But possibly more important than those efforts are actions on the second front — the role of the private sector, Levey added.

“We have also taken public action and made an unprecedented effort to share the information that forms the basis of our actions with firms all over the world,” Levey said. “We have made that evidence public.”

“That information demonstrates that Iran engages in illicit nuclear and ballistic missile transactions, supports terrorist groups and that, in order to conduct those activities, it engages in financial deception to evade the controls of responsible businesses that have no desire to participate in illicit activity,” he added.

---

#### **4. Statement on Gaza by the Middle East Quartet (06-21-2010)** **Quartet declares readiness to work for Mideast economic development**

U.S. Department of State, Office of the Spokesman

The following statement was issued today by the Middle East Quartet (United Nations, European Union, Russian Federation, and the United States).

The Quartet re-affirms that the current situation in Gaza, including the humanitarian and human rights situation of the civilian population, is unsustainable, unacceptable, and not in the interests of any of those concerned. The Quartet reiterates its call for a solution that addresses Israel’s legitimate security concerns, including an end to weapons smuggling into Gaza; promotes Palestinian unity based on the Palestine Liberation Organization commitments and the reunification of Gaza and the West Bank under the legitimate Palestinian Authority; and ensures the unimpeded flow of humanitarian aid, commercial goods and persons to and from Gaza, consistent with United Nations Security Council resolution 1860 (2009). The Quartet declares its readiness to work



closely with Israel, the Palestinian Government and international donors in order to achieve sustainable economic development on the basis of the full implementation of the Agreement on Access and Movement of 2005 and in the broader perspective of the two-state solution.

Consistent with these objectives, the Quartet and the Quartet Representative have worked with Israel, as well as consulting the Palestinian Authority, Egypt, and other concerned parties, to effect a fundamental change in policy in Gaza. The new policy towards Gaza just announced by the Government of Israel is a welcome development. The Quartet notes that the elaboration of further details and modalities of implementation will be important in ensuring the effectiveness of the new policy. Full and effective implementation will comprise a significant shift in strategy towards meeting the needs of Gaza's population for humanitarian and commercial goods, civilian reconstruction and infrastructure, and legitimate economic activity as well as the security needs of Israel. The Quartet will continue to work with Israel, the Palestinian Authority, and other concerned parties to ensure these arrangements are implemented as quickly as possible. The Quartet affirms that much work remains to achieve fully the solution stated above, and, in consultation with the concerned parties, it will monitor closely the implementation of the policy in all its aspects. It will actively explore additional ways to improve the situation in Gaza, encourage involvement of the PA at the crossings and promote greater commerce between the West Bank and Gaza.

The Quartet stresses the importance of United Nations and other international interventions, as well as the work of local non-governmental organizations, to be expanded in Gaza to meet urgent civilian needs, and calls on all parties to fully enable this work.

The Quartet recognizes that Israel has legitimate security concerns that must continue to be safeguarded, and believes efforts to maintain security while enabling movement and access for Palestinian people and goods are critical. The Quartet commits to work with Israel and the international community to prevent the illicit trafficking of arms and ammunition into Gaza. It urges all those wishing to deliver goods to do so through established channels so that their cargo can be inspected and transferred via land crossings into Gaza. The Quartet emphasizes that there is no need for unnecessary confrontations and calls on all parties to act responsibly in meeting the needs of the people of Gaza.

The Quartet also calls for an end to the deplorable detention of Gilad Shalit in advance of the fourth anniversary of his capture on June 25; it further condemns the violation of Hamas' international obligation to provide him access by the International Committee of the Red Cross and demands that Hamas immediately remedy the situation.

The Quartet also reiterates its support for proximity talks toward the resumption, without pre-conditions, of direct bilateral negotiations that resolve all final status issues as previously agreed by the parties. The Quartet believes these negotiations should lead to a settlement, negotiated between the parties within 24 months, that ends the occupation which began in 1967 and results in the emergence of an independent, democratic, and viable Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza, living side by side in peace and security with Israel and its other neighbours.

[White House on Israel's Announcement on Gaza](#) (06-20-2010)

---

**5. Ambassador Holbrooke at U.S.-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue Meeting (06-19-2010)**  
**Envoy discusses challenges such as agriculture, water, energy and health**

U.S. Department of State, Remarks of U.S. Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan, Ambassador Richard C. Holbrooke at a Meeting of U.S.-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue Chairpersons Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Islamabad, Pakistan

It is my pleasure to be here with you today and I am very pleased that my trip has coincided with the efforts of our Strategic Dialogue Working Groups. We've now had seven working groups meet here in Islamabad at the direct request and guidance of Foreign Minister Qureshi. Last week, experts from the U.S. came here to meet with their Pakistani counterparts to discuss science and technology, and defense. This week we had meetings on agriculture, economics, water, market access and energy. In all of these meetings, we are discussing real policy issues and how to work together to advance our common agenda.

Mr. Minister, we have long ago stopped reading talking points and we are now having the policy dialogue that you suggested last year and that Secretary Clinton so strongly endorsed. This is real progress across the board.

On water, this was the first time we have discussed water issues with Pakistan in such detail. More remarkably these discussions involved representatives from all the provinces as well as the various federal agencies involved in this extraordinarily complex issue. Having provincial and federal water experts working together is essential to overcome Pakistan's water scarcity issue. We look forward to supporting your efforts to create a water regulatory authority. Under Secretary Maria Otero noted, we look forward to hosting a group of your federal and provincial water experts in the U.S. this fall to study how the U.S. deals with our own serious federal versus state water issues – an issue that has been at the center of American history for over 150 years.

On market access, of such great importance to Pakistan, we have discussed efforts to advance through Congress the Reconstruction Opportunity Zones legislation. We discussed Pakistan's efforts to advance measures on labor rights and inspections for these ROZs. We also discussed efforts to promote business opportunities for Pakistani textile and apparel manufacturers. I am pleased to announce that the U.S. will support Pakistani producers at a major trade show in New York City, July 13 to 15. We want to give the U.S. business community a chance to learn that that Pakistan is open for business, and we want to help you showcase the quality of your great Pakistani products. This show will offer a chance to match-make with U.S. buyers and is the direct result of efforts under the Strategic Dialogue. I look forward to attending the textile show myself.

On energy, I think we should be encouraged by the continuing engagement on this issue. After all, we only announced our initiatives on energy nine months ago when Secretary Clinton was here in October and now the progress and measures put into place since Prime Minister Gilani convened your energy summit in April are clear. Load shedding has decreased in the urban areas and we have seen a clear government commitment to put energy on a more solid financial footing. We have begun the work of implementing the energy projects announced by Secretary Clinton during her October visit and we did that on previous trips. We are committed to supporting you in this important field.

On the economic issues, our discussions, led by President Obama's Special Assistant on International Economic Affairs David Lipton, are moving forward. Pakistan is at a critical juncture



and the economic reforms now under way will set the stage for a more prosperous future and long term growth.

On agriculture, our experts have engaged on ways to improve Pakistan's cotton and wheat productivity as well as to curb animal and plant disease. Our experts stand ready to assist Pakistan in these efforts and look forward to collaborative research projects with your counterparts. We have also advanced our efforts to open the U.S. market up to Pakistani mango exports. I tried some of your mangoes this morning, as I always do, and they were delicious – I dare say the best in the world, without offending other mango producers. I look forward to having Pakistani mangos in the U.S. with Foreign Minister Qureshi in the not too distant future.

On science and technology, we had an excellent session and we are looking forward to working to find ways to find practical, commercially viable solutions to the big challenges in areas such as agriculture, water, energy and health.

Mr. Minister, this has been a busy week; but it is part of a very busy agenda between the United States and Pakistan. The next meeting, as you mentioned, will be on women's issues led on the Pakistani side by indomitable Dr. Ali and on the American side by Secretary Clinton's senior advisor on this issue, Melanne Verveer. We will also have meetings after that on communications, health, and education, and an important Pakistani delegation is touring the United States right now on communications. We look forward to collaborative participation from the provinces and the federal authorities in all these discussions.

Mr. Minister, our work is just beginning to show some significant results. It is going to take time. These are difficult issues and it takes time to create a reality out of an idea. You took the initiative on these issues. The results are evident in this up-to-date brochure, which we are handing out today, and there will be much more to come. I thank you for your creativity and your initiatives.

On behalf of President Obama, on behalf of Secretary Clinton, on behalf of the United States government, I thank you; and I want to reemphasize our strong commitment to making this Strategic Dialogue work as part of an effort to strengthen Pakistan in the face of so many challenges. Thank you very much.

---

## **6. State's Gordon on U.S. New Approach to Russia (06-18-2010)**

**Russia has produced considerable results to advance U.S. interests, he says**

U.S. Department of State, Philip H. Gordon, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs: Remarks at the German Marshall Fund, Washington, DC, June 16, 2010

### **U.S.-Russia Relations Under the Obama Administration**

Thank you very much for having me here today. It's great to be back at GMF and I look forward to this exchange of views.

This is a timely moment to take stock of U.S.-Russian relations -- eighteen months into the Obama Administration, eighteen months into the "reset" of relations between our two countries, and nearly one year since the Obama-Medvedev summit in Moscow. President Medvedev will soon be traveling to the United States, visiting Silicon Valley and holding a series of meetings in Washington as well. The trip in a sense caps a year and a half of hard work in reorienting our relationship and offers a chance to reflect on how far we've come.

I'd like to start by going through the basic logic of the "reset". When President Obama came into office less than six months after the Georgia war, U.S.-Russian relations were at their lowest point in years and perhaps in the post-Cold War period. There were other troubling events that had colored the recent past as well:

- Gas cutoffs to Ukraine
- A cyber-attack on Estonia
- Virulently anti-Western speeches from Putin including one in which he compared U.S. policies to those of the Third Reich
- The resumption of Russian strategic bomber air patrols along the Norwegian coast and as far away as the Caribbean
- President Medvedev's threat to deploy Iskander missiles to Kaliningrad

President Obama and Secretary Clinton had no illusions about the differences we had and continue to have with Russia, but they also recognized that the level of acrimony and distrust that pervaded U.S.-Russian relations did not serve U.S. interests. Moreover, they saw that the poisonous atmosphere between the two countries was a threat to the stability and security of Europe itself. The relationship was undermined by a lack of trust and the absence of any political structures for constructive dialogue, let alone cooperation. This meant not only were we not getting anything done but that Russia had nothing at stake in its relations with the United States and so was uninterested in considering U.S. positions.

And so the idea behind the reset was a simple one: The United States and Russia have significant common interests and where the United States and Russia have common interests, we should cooperate. Where we have differences, we will be honest about them, both in private and in public, and work to move the Russians to more reasonable positions. We will pursue a better relationship with Russia in our mutual interest and we will do so without sacrificing our principles or our friends. With these basic propositions as a guide, we have pursued a path of principled engagement. And we believe that path has yielded considerable results.

There may have been a time during the course of last year when one could have asked, "What has the reset really gotten us?" It's a legitimate question, but the implied critique is not really sustainable halfway into 2010. The Obama Administration's new approach to Russia has produced considerable results that have advanced U.S. interests on a host of vital issues. Some of the most prominent include:

- The New START Treaty, which is the most comprehensive arms control agreement in nearly two decades. The Treaty cuts – by about a third – the nuclear weapons that the United States and Russia will deploy. It significantly reduces missiles and launchers. It puts in place a strong and effective verification regime. And it maintains the flexibility that we need to protect and advance our national security, to guarantee our commitment to the security of our Allies, and to move responsibly toward world without nuclear weapons.
- We concluded a lethal air transit agreement that has now permits, on average, two U.S. planes a day to fly over Russia carrying troops and supplies in support of the mission in Afghanistan. To date, over 275 flights have carried over 35,000 passengers and valuable cargo. Russia's rail network

has facilitated transit of more than 10,000 containers of supplies. And Russia's willingness to consider NATO's request for helicopters, spare parts, and training to the Afghan National Security Forces open the door to additional important security assistance. About 30% of cargo to Afghanistan goes through the Northern Distribution Network (NDN) and 60% of the NDN goes through Russia.

- Well over 100 meetings and exchanges have taken place under the auspices of the Binational Presidential Commission, bringing together over 60 Russian and American government agencies, not to mention multiple private sector and non-governmental partners. We have achieved concrete results:
- On security, we have agreed to dispose of enough weapons-grade plutonium for 17,000 nuclear warheads;
- On economics, American companies were the first to announce investments in Russia's Skolkovo innovation center, while Russia just awarded a 50-aircraft tender for Boeing 737s worth \$4 billion;
- On people-to-people cooperation, we completed in May our first ever youth basketball exchange in the United States and supported over 40 American cultural events in Russia.
- We are working on many other areas from the environment to terrorism.

The UN Security Council has just enacted a series of tough sanctions against the Iranian regime, aimed at sharpening the choice for Iran between continued isolation and addressing the concerns of the international community about its nuclear program. In crafting and passing this resolution, we worked very closely with the Russian government. This is a real contrast from where things stood on this issue a year ago or even six months ago. I was with Secretary Clinton in Moscow in October when the headlines were "Russia Rebuffs US on Sanctions." We have seen a real change in the Russian attitude. This also comes on the heels of our cooperation on UNSC resolution 1874 on North Korea. These are clear examples where our common interest in preventing nuclear proliferation combined with our new diplomatic approach produced effective action.

We have maintained throughout the efforts to achieve these results a staunch insistence on our values and on defending our principles and friends. Where we agree with Russia, we seek to cooperate – and where we disagree, we do not hesitate to voice our differences. We have a very strong record to stand on of demonstrating the solidity of our strategic commitments and the firm principles behind them. Some have suggested compromises on Central European security, Georgia, and human rights as the "cost" of reset, but the argument does not stand up to scrutiny.

Central Europe. In July 2009, a group of Central European intellectuals released an open letter critical of the Obama Administration's approach to the region. Yet the record clearly shows we have staunchly defended the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Central European states and their basic right to choose their own alliances.

- In September 2009, we announced the new Phased Adaptive Approach for European missile defense – which uses proven and new technology, covers more of Europe, and is therefore more responsive to the current and future security threats the continent faces.
- Nor does our cooperation with Russia imperil in any way our commitment to defend our Allies in accordance with Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Neither the U.S. nor the Alliance views Russia as an enemy. And both the U.S. and our Allies are committed to engaging with Russia on

areas of mutual interest, in particular as regards addressing the new security threats that emanate from outside Europe. At the same time, Article 5 means exactly what it says with respect to protecting the security of all our Allies, no matter where those threats may arise.

Georgia. We have been unambiguous in standing up for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia. We have committed one billion dollars in assistance to Georgia to aid in its reconstruction. We have pursued a strategic partnership with Georgia – something I am actively involved in, with a great deal of high-level interaction between the United States and Georgian governments. And I just spent last week in Geneva in talks aimed at getting Russia to live up to the ceasefire commitments it agreed to in 2008, including pulling back its forces to the positions they held prior to the outbreak of the conflict. We will continue to support Georgia and stand by it.

Human Rights. We also continue to be plainspoken with Russia about our commitment to human rights and democracy. In every senior-level meeting I have participated in with Russian counterparts, these concerns have been raised. We believe that fostering a respect for human rights as well as promoting the development of strong democratic institutions and the rule of law are the keys to a stable, secure and prosperous Russia. The entire Obama Administration has engaged intensively on this issue: the President held a parallel civil society event during his visit, gave a speech in which he emphasized the importance of democracy to students at the New Economic School, met with opposition leaders, and gave an interview to Novaya Gazeta. Secretary Clinton has also met extensively with civil society leaders, gave a speech at Moscow State University describing how political freedom was necessary for progress, and gave an interview on Ekho Moskvi. NSC Senior Director Mike McFaul on his recent trip to Moscow held a civil society event on prison reform and met with Sergei Magnitsky's mother and Mikhail Khodorkovsky's lawyer, and with independent bloggers; I have had my own meetings with human rights groups in Moscow and in DC.

- We also spend \$33.6 million on funding for democracy promotion and civil society in Russia.
- The Civil Society Working Group of the new Bilateral Presidential Commission is providing yet another avenue to pursue these issues with Russian counterparts.

There is, however, a deeper level at which the reset contributes to European security. A better, more stable, more constructive relationship between the United States and Russia is good not just for our two countries, but it is good for Europe as a whole. Contrast the tone of the relationship today with the period from 2006 to 2009. What we have seen is not a merely a change in tone and rhetoric, or just a good personal rapport between presidents. Russia recently agreed to settle a 40-year old border dispute with Norway, on terms that were unacceptable to Gorbachev and Yeltsin. In a hugely symbolic step, NATO troops marched in Moscow's Victory Day parade. Russia has begun an outreach to Poland in the past few months that has already seen Vladimir Putin acknowledge the Katyn Massacre and kneel at a memorial to its victims. In the wake of the tragic plane crash that killed the Polish president and other dignitaries, Russian officials reacted promptly and cooperatively throughout the investigation.

All this demonstrates that the reset in relations cannot be understood as the mere result of a change in U.S. policy. It is just as much the result of a Russia that is willing to engage in pragmatic solutions to the problems we all face. As a leaked foreign policy document published recently in the Russian edition of Newsweek implied, the leaders in the Kremlin now believe that they need and can achieve good relations with both Europe and the United States. This makes sense when you look at Russian interests from a strategic perspective: in a complex and changing world, the principal threats to Russian security do not come from stable democracies in Central Europe.

There is still much more to do as we seek to advance our relationship with Russia – we seek to do more in terms of arms control, we have to deepen our economic relationship, we should work to get the Russians into the WTO, we want to cooperate on the development of missile defense, and we need to make progress on Georgia. Even with more progress, we do not expect that we will always agree with Russia – and when we do not, we will express that disagreement vigorously and we will unyieldingly defend our principles, our commitments, and our allies.

But this opportunity to take stock just as clearly demonstrates how far we've come. It is striking that favorable attitudes towards the United States in Russia have increased from 38 to 54 percent from January 2009 to January 2010. We have a number of concrete achievements brought about by U.S.-Russian engagement, we have continued to keep faith with our allies and our principles, and we have seen substantial progress in creating a more stable European security environment as a whole.

With that, I look forward to our discussion.

---

## **7. New START Enhances U.S.-Russian Relations (06-17-2010)**

By Merle David Kellerhals Jr.  
Staff Writer

Washington — A new nuclear arms reduction treaty will foster a stable, open and predictable relationship between the United States and Russia, who together possess more than 90 percent of the world's nuclear weapons, top leaders in the Obama administration say.

At a Senate hearing June 17, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton said the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), signed by President Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in Prague April 8, reduces global nuclear tensions and enhances efforts to make irresponsible governments accountable to the rest of the world.

“By bringing the New START Treaty into force, we will strengthen our national security more broadly, including by creating greater leverage to tackle a core national security challenge: nuclear proliferation,” Clinton told a Senate committee. The treaty does not compromise nuclear force levels needed to protect the United States and its allies, and it does not constrain missile-defense plans, Clinton added.

Clinton, Defense Secretary Robert Gates, Energy Secretary Stephen Chu and Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the arms control pact. The treaty replaces the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty and the 2002 Moscow Treaty.

Senate Armed Services Chairman Carl Levin, a Democrat from Michigan, reminded committee members that the U.S. Senate has previously approved 10 bilateral arms control agreements with Russia and, before that, the Soviet Union, by overwhelming margins. Approval of the treaty by the U.S. Senate requires a vote of two-thirds of the membership, or 67 votes. The Russian Duma must also approve the treaty.

“This New START Treaty supports a credible nuclear deterrent and maintains the nuclear triad while allowing both the United States and Russia to reduce the total number of nuclear weapons,” Levin said.



Republican Senator John McCain of Arizona said the treaty has to be verifiable, should not limit future missile defense plans, and should ensure that the future U.S. nuclear arsenal is maintained and modernized to provide for an adequate deterrent force.

The landmark START between the United States and Russia lowers the limits on strategic nuclear warheads and the means to deliver them. It effectively reduces the level of warheads each nation possesses to its lowest level in more than 50 years.

Gates told senators that the U.S. nuclear forces will continue to be based on the triad of delivery systems — land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), and strategic long-range bombers. The treaty provides an upper boundary of 1,550 deployed warheads for each nation, and up to 700 deployed ICBMs, deployed SLBMs or heavy bombers. Additionally, the treaty would permit up to 800 deployed and nondeployed missile and submarine launchers or heavy bombers.

“Under this treaty, we retain the power and the freedom to determine the composition of our force structure, allowing the United States complete flexibility to deploy, maintain and modernize our strategic nuclear forces in a manner that best protects our national security interests,” Gates testified.

Mullen told senators that the proposed arms reduction treaty has the full support of the U.S. armed forces, and that it does three key things — allows the United States to keep a strong and flexible nuclear deterrent; helps strengthen openness in relations with Russia; and shows the world the U.S. commitment to reducing the risk of a nuclear incident caused by the irresponsible spread of nuclear weapons from others.

The United States also is working for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and further progress on the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty as additional components of the president’s nuclear agenda.

According to a report from the U.S. Congressional Research Service (CRS), the treaty gives the United States and Russia seven years to reduce forces and remains in force for 10 years from ratification, and it contains detailed definitions and counting rules that will help the parties calculate the number of warheads that count under the treaty limits.

“New START does not limit current or planned U.S. missile defense programs,” the CRS report said.

Along with the New START, Obama also submitted a plan to spend \$80 billion over the next decade to maintain and improve the United States’ nuclear weapons complex, a requirement Republican senators have said is essential for their support of the treaty.

[Clinton’s Opening Remarks at Senate Hearing on New START Treaty \(06-17-2010\)](#)

---